

Remarks

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on February 27, 2006, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. It is respectfully submitted that entry of the above amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 in that the amendments (1) place the claims in condition for allowance or, if necessary, in better condition for consideration on appeal; and (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further consideration or search. For the reasons given above, entry of the above claim amendments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

In the present application, claims 1, 5, and 25 have been amended and claims 4, 8-24, 30, and 33 have been canceled. The claims have been amended to include proper antecedent basis and to incorporate the features specified in canceled claims 4 and 30. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter in the aforementioned claim amendments has previously been presented and thus does not raise new issues or require further consideration and/or search.

In the Office Action, claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chawla (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,640) in view of Astegiano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,706,270, hereinafter “Astegiano”) and/or Erwin et al., (S.I.R. Reg. #H1,802, hereinafter “Erwin”).

Applicants’ Statement of the Substance of the Interview

A telephonic interview between Applicants’ representative Alton Hornsby, III (Registration No. 47,299) and the Examiner was held on May 19, 2006 to discuss the rejection of dependent claims 4 and 30. In the interview, a discussion was held with respect to the disclosure of queries made to a centralized announcement service node via an SS7 network in the cited references Chawla, Astegiano and/or Erwin. Applicants’ representative argued that none of the

cited references disclosed this feature and that in fact Chawla (the cited primary reference) discloses communications to an “announcement node” are made through non-AIN trunk circuits (which one skilled in the art would appreciate would not include the use of an SS7 network). The Examiner responded that his interpretation of the claims was that they disclosed any communications to an announcement node via an SS7 network and that the references supported this interpretation.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-33 are rejected as being unpatentable over Chawla in view of Astegiano and/or Erwin. Claims 4, 8-24, 30, and 33 have been canceled. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a system for providing recorded announcements on a communications network. The system includes at least one central terminal for routing communications on the communication network and in communication with the network, the at least one central terminal further comprising an announcement digital signal processor in communication with the incoming call, wherein the announcement digital signal processor converts one or more digital packet files to voice signals; an announcement service node coupled to the at least one central terminal further comprising a data schema and an application server for accessing the data schema, wherein the application server is accessible by more than one central terminal coupled to the communications network, wherein said data schema comprises a storage mass for storing a plurality of recorded announcement digital packet files that include information for callers on the communications network, and wherein a call from an individual is connected to the announcement digital signal processor at the at least one central terminal, with the announcement digital signal processor receiving an announcement digital packet file from the

announcement service node while the call from the individual is connected to the at least one central terminal and converting the announcement digital packet file to a voice file so as to audibly convey information to the calling individual as the recorded announcement is played from the at least one central terminal during the call; and an SS7 network, wherein the at least one central terminal initiates queries to the announcement service node via the SS7 network.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Chawla, Astegiano, nor Erwin alone or in combination, teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, none of the cited references discloses an SS7 network, wherein at least one central terminal initiates queries to an announcement service node via the SS7 network. In the Office Action, it is alleged that this feature is taught by Chawla at Fig. 2-3, col. 6, line 34-col.7, line 16, and col. 9, lines 55-65. However, Chawla while disclosing an SS7 network, fails to disclose any communications to an announcement node (e.g., the regular non-intelligent switch announcement frame 60 in Fig. 2) via an SS7 network. Instead, Chawla discloses that communications to the switch announcement frame take place through non-AIN trunk circuits (so that pre-existing non-AIN switches may be utilized for announcements by AIN facilities without retrofitting the non-AIN switches with new equipment and software). See Figs. 2-3, col. 3, lines 9-47, col. 6, line 34-col. 7, line 16, and col. 9, lines 55-65. Since Chawla specifically discloses retrieving announcements from a non-AIN switch based component and SS7 is utilized in AIN communications, Chawla fails to disclose initiating queries to an announcement service node via an SS7 network. Astegiano, which discloses sending digitally pre-recorded announcements to telephone subscribers and Erwin, which discloses a system for providing country-specific data for a telecommunications system, also fail to disclose the aforementioned feature.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2-3 and 5-7 each depend from amended independent claim 1 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Amended independent claim 25 specifies similar features as amended independent claim 1 and thus is also allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 26-29 and 31-32 depend from amended independent claim 25 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, claims 2-3, 5-7, 25-29, and 31-32 are also allowable and the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Date: May 30, 2006

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(404) 849-2093